

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

	Diates rateur and reademark Office
ddress:	COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,574	10/17/2003	Nitin Jhingan	END920030060US1 (16845)	2480
23389 7	1590 10/16/2006	EXAMINER		
	OTT MURPHY & PRES	CHEN, TE Y		
SUITE 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			2161	-
			DATE MAILED 1000000	,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/688,574	JHINGAN, NITIN			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Susan Y. Chen	2161			
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Dates of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ware to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	,	•				
1)[\]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Ju	ılv 2006				
		action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar		esecution as to the i	merits is		
٠,٠	closed in accordance with the practice under E	•				
Disposit	ion of Claims					
- 4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.					
اکار۰	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
,	Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
· —	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar.				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Evaminer			
.0,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• , ,	` ,	S 1 121(d)		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	= : :	='			
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 H S C & 110(a)	\-(d) or (f)			
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 33 0.3.3. § 119(a))-(u) or (i).			
۵,		s have been received				
	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			stage		
	application from the International Bureau	•		nago		
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a list	` ''	· ed.			
Attachmen	• •					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
_	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P		•		
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on July 11, 2006.

Claims 1-19 are pending for examination, claims 1, 5, 7-13 and 17 have been amended; claim 19 has been newly added.

Specification

The newly amended specification is acknowledged and placed on record.

However applicant fails to correct the other mistyping, so the disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Section 0029, the word "pofield" is mistyped.

Applicant is required to make a spelling/grammar check of the instant specification and correct the typing/grammar errors as needed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-19, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Page 3

As to claims 1, 7 and 13, Applicant claimed "using a first of the components for reading... using a second of components for receiving... and using a third of components for receiving and for loading... wherein each of components operates independently of the other of the components and... can be modified, adjusted, and replaced independently of the others of the components...", however, the instant specification fails to disclose or teaches or even suggest how the first reading component can be modified, adjusted, and replaced independently by the second receiving component or the third receiving/loading components and vise versa. In addition, the specification fails to disclose why there is a need to modify, adjust, and replace the first, second and third components with each other, therefore, the claimed subject matters are deemed to be indefinite and no patentable weight will be given to the claimed modification, adjusting and replacing operations that applied to the claimed components.

As to claim 19, it is not understood what is it meant by "field length fields".

As to claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-19, these claims have the same defects as their base claim 1, hence are rejected for the same reason.

Because the ambiguous nature of instant invention, the following art rejection is to the best the examiner is able to ascertain. Furthermore, claim 19 will have no art rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Michaelides (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0181753).

Claim 1:

Michaelides discloses a method for mapping data from source to a data destination [e.g., Abstract, lines 6-9], comprising the steps:

Providing a plurality of separate components for performing defined functions to map the data from the source to the destination [e.g., The title, Abstract, Fig. 6, section 0058], the plurality of components performing the steps of

i) using a first of the components for reading data from the source [e.g., the unit 103, Fig. 6 and associated texts, the use of the generic software adapter GUI to read/feed from source data at section: 0062];

Art Unit: 2161

ii) using a second of the components for receiving the data from the first of the

components and for processing the read data according to a set of rules [e.g., units:

101, 102, 105, of Fig. 6 and associated texts]; and

iii) using the third of the components for receiving the data from the second of the

Page 5

component and loading the processed data into the destination [e.g., the unit 104, Fig. 6

and associated texts, a target feed is activated, data is load from the source feed and

written to the target at section: 0062].

Wherein, each of the components is interactively operated independently of the

others, and can be dynamically modified, adjusted, and replaced independently [e.g.,

sections: 0064 - 0067] to facilitate mapping data from a plurality of different data source

into the data destination [e.g., Fig(s). 9-10 and associated texts].

Claim 2:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses the steps of

iv) verifying the integrity of the read data [e.g., the use of Verify Button at section:

0095; the use of Verified feed at section: 0191; the use of LdapUtilities at section: 0198]:

and

v) logging results into a file [e.g., the use of GALogger at section: 0199].

Claim 3:

Art Unit: 2161

Except the features recited in claim 2, Michaelides further discloses a respective one of the components performs each of the steps (i) – (v) [e.g., the unit 50, Fig. 6 and associated texts].

Page 6

Claim 4:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses that the data source is a flat file [e.g., the units: FileFeedDataSourceImpl,

FixedFileFeedDataSourceReaderImpl, etc at section: 0202] and the destination is a database [e.g., section: 0203].

Claim 5:

Except the features recited in claim 2, Michaelides further discloses that the plurality of components perform the further step of sending the results, by e-mail to a configured list of email addresses [e.g., Fig. 14 and associated texts; section: 0193].

Claim 6:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Michaelides further discloses that the step of formatting the read data for placement in the data destination [e.g., the use of Formatting engine 102, Fig. 6 and associated texts].

Art Unit: 2161

As to claims 7-12 and 13-18, these claims recite the same features as claims 1-6 in form of a framework and program storage medium, hence, are rejected for the same reason.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on July 11, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments based on the newly amended features against 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections are moot in view of new ground rejection.

The examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments and piecemeal interpretations that "The prior art does not disclose or suggest the use of such independent components in process of mapping data from a source to destination."

In reply to these arguments, the examiner points out that Michaelides clearly discloses the claimed limitations as following:

- i) using a first of the components for reading data from the source [e.g., the unit 103, Fig. 6 and associated texts, the use of the generic software adapter GUI to read/feed from source data at section: 0062];
- ii) using a second of the components for receiving the data from the first of the components and for processing the read data according to a set of rules [e.g., units: 101, 102, 105, of Fig. 6 and associated texts]; and

Art Unit: 2161

iii) using the third of the components for receiving the data from the second of the component and loading the processed data into the destination [e.g., the unit 104, Fig. 6 and associated texts, a target feed is activated, data is load from the source feed and written to the target at section: 0062].

Wherein, each of the components is interactively operated independently of the others, and can be dynamically modified, adjusted, and replaced independently [e.g., sections: 0064 - 0067] to facilitate mapping data from a plurality of different data source into the data destination [e.g., Fig(s). 9-10 and associated texts].

Thus, based on the discussion above, the examiner maintains her rejection position.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Application/Control Number: 10/688,574 Page 9

Art Unit: 2161

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Susan Y Chen Examiner Art Unit 2161

Arman Comment

Art Unit: 2161

October 5, 2006

Page 10